

b.) Remarks

The claims have been amended to more specifically recite the novel features of the present invention.

In the December 1, 2008 Advisory Action, the Examiner entered the Amendment after Final Rejection but maintains the rejection of record. In this regard, the Examiner states

Applicants is arguing inherency. However, Examiner contends it would be obvious to administer Applicant's compound to also treat individuals [sic] with restless [leg] syndrome or nocturnal myoclonus because there is an overlapping population of patients that have both PD and restless leg syndrome and/or nocturnal myoclonus. Thus, it would be obvious that by administering [sic, treating] PD with Applicant's compound, that one would also be treating restless leg syndrome and/or nocturnal myoclonus in said overlapping population of patients. (Emphasis added.)

That is, the Examiner is still arguing inherency. Such was addressed by Applicants' prior discussion.

In any event, however, the Examiner's comments are believed to be addressed by the foregoing amendment to claims 1 and 8.

Entry hereof is earnestly solicited.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Lawrence S. Perry/
Lawrence S. Perry
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 31,865

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

LSP\ac

FCHS_WS 2721013_1.DOC